microphone is not properly connected to the real-time audio communication system based on the comparison of the values of the auto-correlation function coefficients with the predetermined values.

With regard to claim 1, the Office Action asserts that Itakura describes each element, but recognizes a deficiency by Itakura in its failure to describe determining whether a microphone is, or is not, properly connected to a real-time audio communication system based on a comparison of values of auto-correlation function coefficients with predetermined values. See Office Action of August 12, 2005 at pages 2-3 (citing Itakura at pages 792-793). For this deficiency, the Office Action relies on Kim. See Office Action of August 12, 2005 at page 3 (citing Kim at col. 2, lines 11-30). Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Kim describes a method for detecting when a microphone is, or is not, connected to a microphone input jack of an audio apparatus. See Kim at abstract. More particularly, Kim describes a method for detecting when a microphone is, or is not, connected to a microphone input jack by connecting a microphone detector to a general purpose input/output terminal and then providing for connection of a microphone to the microphone detector. See Kim at col. 5, line 62 to col. 6, line 3 and col. 6, lines 23-26. To determine if a microphone is connected to the microphone detector (and thus, whether a microphone is connected to the general purpose input/output terminal), the method described by Kim detects a voltage level of the input terminal at which the microphone detector is connected to the general purpose input/output. See Kim at col. 6, lines 23-26. If the input terminal is at a low level (e.g., the microphone detector outputs a low signal), a microphone is deemed to be connected. See Kim at col. 6, lines 3-7 and 26-29. If the input terminal is at a high level (e.g., the microphone detector outputs a high signal), a microphone is deemed not connected. See Kim at col. 6, lines 7-9.

As such, Kim uses electrical signals to detect the presence or absence of a microphone. Kim does not use auto-correlation function coefficients for such a determination, as required by claim 1. In fact, in the absence of the hindsight gleaned from the present disclosure, Kim is best described as providing an alternative method for determining whether a microphone is connected to an audio apparatus.

Even the Office Action recognizes that Kim describes an alternate method by stating that the motivation to combine Kim with Itakura is that "it is extremely beneficial to check whether

or not the microphone is connected before wasting resources in analyzing the audio sample just to find out the microphone is disconnected." See Office Action of August 12, 2005 at page 4 (emphasis added). In other words, the Office Action asserts that Kim describes a method for detecting whether a microphone is connected to an audio apparatus before recording an audio sample. In contrast, the method of claim 1 recites a determination of whether a microphone is, or is not, connected to a real-time audio communication system after recording an audio sample through the real-time audio communication system.

As such, Kim describes a method for detecting whether a microphone is, or is not, connected to an audio apparatus that is an alternative to the method recited in claim 1. Thus, Kim does not cure the shortcoming of Itakura with respect to describing a method for detecting whether or not a microphone is connected to a real-time audio communication system of a computer that includes determining whether a microphone is, or is not, properly connected to the real-time audio communication system based on a comparison of values of auto-correlation function coefficients with predetermined values.

Accordingly, Itakura, Kim, or any proper combination of the references, does not describe or suggest a method for detecting whether or not a microphone is connected to a real-time audio communication system of a computer that includes determining whether a microphone is, or is not, properly connected to a real-time audio communication system based on the comparison of values of auto-correlation function coefficients with predetermined values, as recited in claim 1. Applicant therefore submits that the Office Action has not properly made a prima facie case of obviousness. For at least these reasons, applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1.

Independent claim 2 recites a computer program, residing on a computer-readable medium, for detecting whether or not a microphone is connected to an audio communication system of a computer in a manner corresponding to that of claim 1, and independent claim 3 recites a computer system running programmed processes for doing the same. Accordingly, for the reasons noted above with respect to claim 1, applicant requests withdrawal of the rejection of claims 2-3.

No fee is believed due. Please apply any charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: Oct. 12, 2005

Barbara A. Benoit for Barbara A. Benoit
Reg. No. 54,777

W. Karl Renner
Reg. No. 41,265

Fish & Richardson P.C.
1425 K Street, N.W.
11th Floor
Washington, DC 20005-3500
Telephone: (202) 783-5070
Facsimile: (202) 783-2331

40305409.doc